

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,492	03/23/2004	Howard Loewenthal	12873/04788	3064
24024	7590 08/29/2006		EXAM	INER
CALFEE HALTER & GRISWOLD, LLP 800 SUPERIOR AVENUE			GROSZ, ALEXANDER	
SUITE 1400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CLEVELAND, OH 44114			3673	

DATE MAILED: 08/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/807,492	LOEWENTHAL, HOWARD			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Alexander Grosz	3673			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on PIRIOS 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s)					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on (100) is/are: a) (100) is/are: a) (100) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/807,492

Art Unit: 3673

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: The species of figures 1-12, and the species of figures 13-15. The species are independent or distinct because they set forth patentably distinct features of beds, that have require separate searches.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Szabo on or about 1/13/06 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of the species of figures1-2, claims 1-14. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 15-17 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/807,492

Art Unit: 3673

The Appendix filed on 3/23/06, with a date of 1/7/04, appears to be a blueprint of the disclosed and claimed invention, and NOT PRIOR ART against the pending claims. If that is not the case, applicant must identify the Appendix as prior art.

On page 4, lines 4 and 7, numeral 44 is confusingly used to identify different elements. Numeral 90 (page 7, line 11) must be inserted in the drawings.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4,7-9, 12,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not clear what the term "latch" means, as used in the claims. For example, in claims 1 and 7, does the term "latch" refer to a pin, a tongue, an opening, a chamber, a spring, or a combination of some or all of the above elements.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 5,6,8,10,11,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Sagel. Note figure 1, col. 4, lines 37-56.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/807,492

Art Unit: 3673

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4,7,9,12,14, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sagel, teaching applicant's basic device, but not specifying elements of a conventional "latch", in view of Grant (note fig. 5,# bridging columns 3 and 4), Carroll et al. (note Figure 11), or Hay et al. (note Figure 4A), all teaching the releasably connect elements of a bed with a conventional "latch" structure that include a spring biased pin and a slotted tongue. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have used a conventional "latch" as the releasable connecting means in Sagel's bed frame, because Grant, Carroll et al., and Hay et al. recognize the use of conventional latch means in releasably attaching elements of bed frames to each other.

Kertesz (note fig. 2), teaching the use of a "latch " type fastener, in a bed frame, Marcyan (note fig. 7) and Hu (note fig. 4) is cited as relevant art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Grosz whose telephone number is 571-272-7041. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patricia Engle can be reached on 571-272-6660. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3673

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000

Alexander Grosz Brimary Examiner Art Unit 3673

8/22/06

ag